



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/964,257	11/04/1997	HITOSHI TERASHIMA	56356	2047
23872 7590 02/15/2008 MCGLEW & TUTTLE, PC P.O. BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION SCARBOROUGH, NY 10510-9227			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MADELEINE ANH VINH	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/15/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08964257	11/4/97	TERASHIMA ET AL.	56356

MCGLEW & TUTTLE, PC
P.O. BOX 9227
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NY 10510-9227

EXAMINER

Madeleine AV. Nguyen

ART UNIT	PAPER
2625	20080211

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed on February 08, 2008 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

Madeleine AV Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2625

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: 56356RCE5

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : TERASHIMA et al.
Serial No : 08/964,257
Confirm. No : 2047
Filed : November 4, 1997
For : APPARATUS EQUIPPED...
Art Unit : 2622
Examiner : M. Nguyen
Dated : February 8, 2008

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the Examiner's Answer of December 11, 2007 Applicant hereby replies.

Claims 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tajima

The Examiner states that the two surfaces forming the second sheet transporting path in Tajima, namely recessed portion A and a surface of the printer device 3, is not a sheet transporting path since the surfaces cannot transport the sheet downward. Appellant respectfully disagrees. Claim 7 does not require that the surface of the scanner apparatus and the surface of the base apparatus transport the sheet downward. Claim 7 only defines the second transport path using the surfaces of a scanner apparatus and a base apparatus, i.e. a path that a sheet of paper travels along when the scanner is mounted to the base apparatus. Claim 7 provides that a second sheet travels along a second transporting path that is defined by a

Noted
RJ
2/11/08